**Conference Call Friday, July 9, 2010**

1. **Norms/Rules of Engagement**
   1. NATE Membership is a requirement
   2. Confidentiality (Joe) – What happens in the CoP stays in the CoP?
      1. Generic resources (articles, etc) are not an issue
      2. Personal stories must be kept confidentiality
   3. Brainstorming Rules (Peter
      1. All ideas put forward are valid and must be respected
      2. No Ad Hominem attacks (Jane, you ignorant slut); no flaming
      3. Honest disagreement is ok (and perhaps welcome)
   4. What about inviting outsiders (experts)
      1. how does that impact confidentiality issues?
         1. They must be asked to accept our confidentiality rules.
      2. Must they be a NATE member?
      3. How do we choose such a person?
         1. (Beth suggested a consensus model)
         2. Perhaps put a suggested person’s name and topic on the Ning and let people weigh in
   5. Distributed Leadership
   6. Peter – this is a process. We need to get our heads around where it is going and the Rules of the road need to be flexible and thought out as we go.
   7. Beth – A norm may be that the development of protocols is ongoing
2. **Refine and revise goals and Design Team tasks**
   1. Pre-stated goals:
      1. Professional Learning
      2. Help Educators map their role in the synagogue
      3. Design staff and lay leader programming for their synagogue
   2. Discussion
      1. Beth – Very much focused on the Temple Educator, and NATE is expanding beyond that goal. If we are going to focus only on Temple Educators, we should be more explicit about that.
      2. Joe – we might want to be more responsive to the needs of others
      3. Josh – as a CoP, we should – at least initially – be more job-alike
      4. Mara – OK to be just temple educators. People can belong to more than one. Perhaps this becomes the model for forming more CoP’s
      5. Ira – agreeing with all of this. Understand that there are other CoP’s being form by other fellows to meet the needs of other roles. And NATE can choose to form additional CoP’s for other roles as well.
      6. Melissa – we can be a little more open. CoP is for people with a passion about the work and there may be “fellow travelers” who might want to be a part of the conversation. i.e. a congregational rabbi who is a NATE member.
      7. Agreed to focus on the Role of Temple Educators within NATE. Not trying to be everything to all people, and NATE-member fellow travelers will be welcome.
3. **Design Team Tasks –** above items and:
   1. Talk to folks on other side of digital divide and learn what their needs are.
      1. Melissa – wondering about end/middle goal – is it about meeting everyone’s needs, or is it about openness to anyone who wants to play.
      2. Ira – not trying to be all things to all people, but wanting to avoid telling people if you can’t handle the technology you can’t play. How do we reach out to people who want to engage in the conversation but who are intimidated by the technology
      3. Peter – those who are embracing the Web 2.0 risk using the tech because it is cool, not because it is the right way to communicate.
   2. Planning activities for the group
      1. Some synchronous, some asynchronous
      2. Communicating with those planning other activities for NATE
   3. Each of the design team members is obligated to find two more people to join in the ongoing conversation
      1. Beth suggests some coordination
      2. We will have a master list for the Lamed Vavnikim on the wiki; add names as you get agreement
      3. Remember they must be NATE members
4. **Initial Conversation**
   1. Ira discussed what was stated in the initial document – exploring our role: (re)defining and mapping how we serve our synagogues.
   2. Distributed leadership will tell us when it is time to move on to another topic. Maybe we create a scorekeeping device? Josh – Facilitator might fill this role. Ira – perhaps a back channel conversation might make this happen. Facilitator can be the conduit. And the talking stick may be passed around. Ira’s role is monitoring the system, looking for improvement, not necessarily as the facilitator.
   3. Discussion of initial conversation
      1. Ira’s idea of the educator as chief relationship officer – recruiting people to make connections within the synagogue. Face to face social networking
      2. Beth – May be too broad a topic. What if we refine it to the question of working to transform the understanding of Bar/Bat Mitzvah as the end-point. How to move the focus away from B/M.
      3. Joe agreed. In creating so many opportunities for talking about B/M we give the message that it is the end result, the ultimate goal. Relationships and the messages we send are key.
      4. Ira concerned that this becomes just about retention.
      5. Joe – we need to reframe the context of the conversations. People come in for Tot Shabbat and leave until third grade because of financial issues. They wait until they must join.
      6. Beth – By having an enrollment requirement for B/M we frame the conversation around B/M. We are not talking only about post B/m retention
      7. Mara – hints at a larger issue that we don’t need to use the language of B/M: Rethinking the cultures of our synagogues – **How do we help members and potential members really find a sense of priority in being a part of the synagogue and all it has to offer?** If it is about lifelong learning and not B/M, how do we as educational leaders, along with the clergy and lay leaders make the synagogue and synagogue community more of a priority for the members? This is about adults. **Rethinking the culture of the synagogue and how do we help people find a place in the synagogue and prioritize their membership**
      8. Josh – I see a goal disconnect, which leads us to the B/M conversation, about what Jewish Education is all about. **How do we create programs that reflect goals that we are proud of and that congregants can actually buy into?**
      9. Peter – this is the same conversation that you and I had in an airport in Seattle a decade ago. I fear this may be something so humongous that we may get lost. Where can we start building this building? We want parents to feel more connected and transfer it to their kids. That is so big. Where can we start small? Ira: This is a product of the conversation with the larger group. We just need to start. Josh – By having the conversation in the CoP, we are not focusing on the entire Jewish people, we are focusing on our own practice.